SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY INITIAL STUDY ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

This form and the descriptive information in the application package constitute the contents of Initial Study pursuant to County Guidelines under Ordinance 3040 and Section 15063 of the State CEQA Guidelines.

USGS QUAD:

Helendale

PLANNING AREA: Victor Valley Sub-region

IMPROVEMENT LEVEL: IL-4

T,R,SECTION: T7N, R4W, Sec.7, SE 1/4

THOMAS BROS: Pg 4025, Grid J-2

COMMUNITY: Helendale

OLUD: RL (Rural Living)

APN: 0467-142-15

APPLICANT: HIMMELRICK, JEFFREY & MARTHA

PROPOSAL: A) GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT FROM

RURAL LIVING (RL) TO RURAL COMMERCIAL (CR); B) CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT TO ESTABLISH A 2,032 SF RESTAURANT ON 2.55

ACRES

COMMUNITY: HELENDALE/1ST SUPERVISORIAL DISTRICT LOCATION: EAST SIDE OF NATIONAL TRAILS HIGHWAY.

APPROXIMATELY 750' SOUTH OF RINALDI

ROAD

JCS/INDEX: 12324CF1/DN149-250N/2004/GPA01/CUP01

STAFF: Tracy Creason

REP(S): N/A

IN/A

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

1. Project Title: Himmelrick GPA & CUP

2. Lead Agency Name and Address:

County of San Bernardino Land Use Services Department Current Planning Division 15505 Civic Drive Victorville, CA 92392

3. Contact person and phone number:

Tracy Creason, Senior Associate Planner Phone: 760-243-8245: Fax: 760-243-8212

4. Project location:

East side of National Trails Highway, approximately 750 feet south of Rinaldi Road, Helendale

5. Project sponsor's name and address:

Jeffrey & Martha Himmelrick 16950 Wild Road Helendale, CA 92324 760-245-9687

6. Description of project:

A General Plan Amendment to change the Official Land Use District from Rural Living (RL) to Rural Commercial (CR) and a Conditional Use Permit to establish a 2,032 square foot restaurant on 2.55 acres.

PROJECT SUMMARY:

The project proposal is a General Plan Amendment to change the Official Land Use District from Rural Living to Rural Commercial and a Conditional Use Permit to establish a restaurant on 2.55 acres. The proposed project is located on the east side of National Trails Highway, a.k.a. Historic Route 66, approximately 750 ft south of Rinaldi Road in the unincorporated area of Helendale. The site contains a single-family residence, a triplex, miscellaneous outbuildings, and the building proposed to be the restaurant. It is adjacent to an existing daycare center, Carousel Day Care. The other adjacent properties are vacant.

ENVIRONMENTAL/EXISTING SITE CONDITIONS:

The site is located on the east side of National Trails Highway, a.k.a. Historic Route 66, approximately 750 feet south of Rinaldi Road in the unincorporated area of Helendale. The site is flat to gently sloping. The natural vegetation has been removed from the site during previous development. No trees exist on site.

SURROUNDING LAND USES:

	EXISTING LAND USE	OFFICIAL LAND USE DISTRICT	IL
Project Site	Single Family Residence, Triplex, Outbuildings, Building previously & proposed to be a restaurant	RL	4
North	Vacant	RL	4
South	Daycare	RL	4
East	Daycare	RL	4
West	National Trails Highway/Rural Residential	RL	4

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The e	environmental factors checked below wo entially Significant Impact" as indicated by	uld be y the	e potentially affected by this project checklist on the following pages.	, involving at least one impact that is a			
	Aesthetics		Agriculture Resources	☐ Air Quality			
	Biological Resources		Cultural Resources	Geology /Soils			
□ F	Hazards & Hazardous Materials		Hydrology / Water Quality	☐ Land Use/ Planning			
	/lineral Resources		Noise	☐ Population / Housing			
□ F	Public Services		Recreation	☐ Transportation/Traffic			
□ ι	Jtilities / Service Systems		Mandatory Findings of Significant	ce			
DETE	ERMINATION: (To be completed by the	Lead	Agency)				
On th	ne basis of this initial evaluation, the follow	wing f	inding is made:				
\boxtimes	The proposed project COULD NOT have be prepared.	e a si	gnificant effect on the environment,	and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION wil			
	Although the proposed project could have in this case because revisions in the proposed NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.	oject l	have been made by or agreed to by				
	The proposed project MAY have a sign is required.	ifican	t effect on the environment, and an	ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT			
	The proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact or the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.						
Signa	ature (prepared by Tracy Creason)	_	Date				
	Rynerson, AICP, ion Chief, Current Planning Division		Date				

August 2004 2

For Land Use Services Director

HIM	IMELRICK GPA & CUP (JOB #12324CF1)	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorp.	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact	
I.	AESTHETICS — Would the project:					
a)	Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?			\boxtimes		
b)	Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?			\boxtimes		
c)	Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?			\boxtimes		
d)	Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?			\boxtimes		
SU	BSTANTIATION (check <a> if project is located within the viewshe	d of any Scen	ic Route listed in the	e General Pl	an):	
a)	The proposed project would be located in an existing structure that the structure as a restaurant would enhance the aesthetics of the adversely impact a scenic vista.					
b)						
c)	As stated in a) above, the structures exist and will be improved a to the area are anticipated.	s a result of the	his project. No sign	ificant visual	impacts	
d)	The project will require parking lot and building lighting. Adher downshielding will prevent any adverse impacts to day or nighttime			linances tha	t require	
II.	AGRICULTURE RESOURCES — In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:					
a)	Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?				\boxtimes	
b)	Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				\boxtimes	
c)	Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?				\boxtimes	

III. AIR QUALITY — Where available, the significance

Potentially Significant Impact Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorp. Less than Significant Impact

No Impact

SUBSTANTIATION (check __ if project is located in the Important Farmlands Overlay):

- a) The project site is not located within an Important Farmland Overlay, so the proposed project would not convert any such farmland to non-agricultural use.
- b) There is no Williamson Act contract on the property. The property is currently zoned Rural Living and part of the proposal is to change that to Rural Commercial. It is not zoned for agricultural use.
- c) The proposed project would not change the existing environment in any way that would convert any farmland to a non-agricultural use. There are no agricultural uses nearby that would be impacted.

	criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:			
a)	Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?			\boxtimes
b)	Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?		\boxtimes	
c)	Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?		\boxtimes	
d)	Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?			\boxtimes
e)	Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?			\boxtimes

SUBSTANTIATION (discuss conformity with the South Coast Air Quality Management Plan, if applicable):

- a) The project site is located in the Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District (MDAQMD) that encompasses the desert portion of northern San Bernardino County. The MDAQMD boundaries cover the area from the summit of the Cajon Pass north to Inyo County, east of the Colorado River and the state lines of Arizona and Nevada, and westward to the Los Angeles and Kern County lines. It encompasses an area of over 21,000 square miles. The project will not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the Mojave Desert Air Quality Plan because the proposed uses do not exceed the thresholds established for air quality concerns. The CEQA Air Quality Handbook developed by the South Coast Air Quality Management District and used as a guide by the Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District established these thresholds. The project will serve the traveling public and local residents and will not contribute a significant traffic increase as based on the handbook criteria. The project does not propose any grading or earth disturbance activities. The project will not contribute in any substantial way to the degradation of local or regional air quality. The parking area on site is concrete and the driveway approaches will be paved. There will be landscaping on site to reduce wind-blown dust and/or particulate matter. The project does not conflict with the MDAQMD Air Quality Plan.
- b) The proposed restaurant will not violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. The proposed use does not exceed established thresholds of concern as established by the MDAQMD.
- c) The MDAQMD is a non-attainment area for ozone at both the state and national level, due mostly to its location downwind of the Los Angeles Basin and to a lesser extent the San Joaquin Valley. The proposed restaurant's 2032 square foot size is a fraction of the 23,000 square foot threshold established for a restaurant. The trips associated with a restaurant this size will not substantially contribute to the ozone violation.

Potentially Significant Impact Less than
Significant with
Mitigation Incorp.

Less than Significant Impact

No Impact

- d) The adjacent daycare center is identified as a sensitive receptor, but the project will not generate substantial pollutant concentrations. There is no potential to expose the identified sensitive receptor to substantial pollutant concentrations.
- e) The project will not create odors affecting a substantial number of people because there are no identified uses that will result in the production of objectionable odors. The Division of Environmental Health Services is requiring that waste generated by the proposed restaurant be contained in an approved trash enclosure and removed from the site at least 2 times per week.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES — Would the project:

a)	Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?		\boxtimes	
b)	Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?			\boxtimes
c)	Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?			\boxtimes
d)	Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?			\boxtimes
e)	Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?		\boxtimes	
f)	Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?			\boxtimes

SUBSTANTIATION (check if project is located in the Biological Resources Overlay <u> </u> or contains habitat for any species listed in the California Natural Diversity Database __):

- a) Although the site is located in an area that is designated as potential habitat for the Desert Tortoise and the Mojave Ground Squirrel, the site does not contain suitable vegetation to support either species. The site is developed with existing structures, there is development on adjacent and nearby properties, and the site contains no native vegetation. The possibility for occupation of the site by either sensitive species is substantially reduced. The project will not have a substantial adverse effect on any such species.
- b) This project will not have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service. The project site has no such biological resources, riparian habitat or sensitive natural community identified on site.

Potentially Significant Impact Less than
Significant with
Mitigation Incorp.

Less than Significant Impact

No Impact

- c) This project will not have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means. The project is not within an identified protected wetland.
- d) This project will not interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites. There are no such corridors or nursery sites within or near the project site.
- e) This project will not conflict with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources. Although the site has the potential to contain protected native desert plants, previous development eliminated native vegetation.
- f) This project will not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. No such plan has been adopted in the area of the project site.

	adopted in the area of the project site.							
٧.	CULTURAL RESOURCES — Would the project:							
a)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?				\boxtimes			
b)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?				\boxtimes			
c)	Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?			\boxtimes				
d)	Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?				\boxtimes			
	JBSTANTIATION (check if the project is located in the Cucultural resource review):	ltural _ or Paleontologic _	Resources	overlays or o	cite results			
a)b)c)d)	located in an area that has any potential for prehistoric and historic resources as identified by the County Museum. This project does not have the potential to cause a substantial adverse change to an archaeological resource. The site is not located in an area that has any potential for prehistoric and historic archaeological resources as identified by the County Museum. Although the project site is located in an area with documented or known paleontological resources, the site is developed. There is no additional construction proposed that would destroy any such paleontological resources. There will be no adverse impacts.							
VI.	GEOLOGY AND SOILS — Would the project:							
a)	Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or deat involving:	h						
	i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated of the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoni Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or ba on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refe Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 4	ng ased er to			\boxtimes			
	ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?			\boxtimes				
		•						

HIM	IMELRICK GPA & CUP (JOB #12324CF1)	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorp.	Less than Significant Impact	No Impac
	iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?				\boxtimes
	iv) Landslides?				\boxtimes
b)	Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?				\boxtimes
c)	Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?				\boxtimes
d)	Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18- 1-B of the Uniform Building Code (2001), creating substantial risks to life or property?				\boxtimes
e)	Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?				\boxtimes
SU	BSTANTIATION (check $_$ if project is located in the Geologic H	azards Overlay I	District):		
a) b) c) d) e)	The project will not expose people or structures to potential sufor death involving; i) rupture of a known earthquake fault, ii) is failure, including liquefaction or iv) landslides. There are no sof the project site. The project will be reviewed and approved standards implemented in the construction of the project to insuffice the project does not propose any additional ground disturbance. The project does not propose any additional ground disturbance to the fairly flat nature of the site, erosion is unlikely to occur the project is not identified as being located on a geologic of having the potential to result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral is the project site is not located in an area that has been identified the potential for expansive soils. The site is currently served by on-site water wells and a seption to the project site is currently served by on-site water wells and a seption to the project site is currently served by on-site water wells and a seption to the project will be no advised to the	trong seismic graden geologic had by County Build are that structure ce or construction are. A majority of anit or soil that he spreading, subsided by the County are system. These	ound shaking, iii) s zards identified in ding and Safety wit s can endure a seis in that would result f the site will be par las been identified dence, liquefaction Building and Safet	the immediate the immediate the appropriate smic event. in the loss owed and lands as being unsor collapse. by Geologist a	d ground e vicinity e seismid f topsoil. scaped. stable or s having
	. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS— ould the project:				
a)	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?				\boxtimes
b)	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?				\boxtimes
c)	Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				\boxtimes
d)	Be located on a site which is included on a list of				

HIM	MELRICK GPA & CUP (JOB #12324CF1)	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorp.	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact		
	hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?				\boxtimes		
e)	For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				\boxtimes		
f)	For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				\boxtimes		
g)	Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				\boxtimes		
h)	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?				\boxtimes		
SU	BSTANTIATION:						
a)b)c)	The project will not create a significant hazard to the public or disposal of hazardous materials. The proposed project does not such uses are proposed on-site in the future, they will be subject Division of the County Fire Department. The project will not create a significant health hazard to the purposet and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous construction activity that might use hazardous materials is subject Division of the County Fire Department. The project uses will not emit hazardous emissions or handle has waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.	t involve the used to permit and blic or the envisements materials into ect to permit and action and actions or actions and actions of actions	se or transport of had inspection by the ironment through reported the environment. Indicate the inspection by the utely hazardous ma	azardous mate Hazardous I easonably fore Any propose Hazardous I terials, substa	erials. If Materials eseeable d use or Materials ances, or		
d) e) f) g)	The project site is not within the vicinity or approach/departure flight path of a public airport. The project site is not within the vicinity or approach/departure flight path of a private airstrip. The project will not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan, because the project has adequate access from two or more directions.						
	. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY — Would the ject:						
a)	Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?				\boxtimes		
b)	Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production						

HIM	MELRICK GPA & CUP (JOB #12324CF1)	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorp.	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
	rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?			\boxtimes	
c)	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?			\boxtimes	
d)	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?			\boxtimes	
e)	Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?			\boxtimes	
f)	Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?				\boxtimes
g)	Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?				\boxtimes
h)	Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?				\boxtimes
i)	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?			\boxtimes	
j)	Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				\boxtimes

SUBSTANTIATION:

- a) The project's water will be provided by existing, on-site, water wells. Wastewater is discharged into an existing on-site septic system. County Environmental Health Services will review and verify that all water quality standards and waste discharge requirements are adhered with.
- b) The project will not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level. County Environmental Health Services will oversee water quality and quantity to verify that both meet the needs of the proposed project and have no adverse impacts.
- c) The project will not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site. The project does not propose any substantial alteration to a drainage pattern, stream or river and the project is required to submit and implement an erosion control plan.
- d) The site will not require grading. The buildings and concrete parking area already exist on site. No additional impermeable surfaces will occur. The site has a flat to gently sloping grade and runoff is not expected to be an issue. The proposed project does not significantly alter the existing drainage pattern of the site.
- e) The project will not create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff.

August 2004

Potentially Significant Impact Less than
Significant with
Mitigation Incorp.

Less than Significant Impact

No Impact

- f) The project will not otherwise substantially degrade water quality because appropriate measures relating to water quality protection are required by County code.
- g) The project will not place unprotected housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a Federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map. County Public Works has reviewed the project and determined that the project is not within any identified flood hazard areas.
- h) The project will not place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows. The site is not located within a 100-year flood hazard area and any area identified as being potentially affected by a 100-year storm the structures will be subject to a flood hazard review.
- i) The project will not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam. The project site is not within any identified path of a potential inundation flow that might result in the event of a dam or levee failure or that might occur from a river, stream, lake, or sheet flow situation.
- j) The project will not be impacted by inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow, because the project is not adjacent to any body of water that has the potential of seiche or tsunami nor is the project site in the path of any potential mudflow.

IX.	LAND USE AND PLANNING — Would the project:				
a)	Physically divide an established community?				
b)	Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance)				
	adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?				\boxtimes
c)	Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?				\boxtimes
SU	BSTANTIATION:				
a) b)	The purpose of the Rural Commercial land use district is to prointermixed with residential uses in order to meet the needs. General Plan Amendment proposes to create a Rural Commercial Plan Amendment proposes to create a Rural Commercial Uses to serve the local residents and travelers along Historic together, not divide it. It is proposing to add a small 'Mom & Pour The site currently has an Official Land Use Designation (OLU OLUD to Rural Commercial (CR). The Improvement Level is a site to provide sites in rural areas with a range of commercial uneeds of the remote population and the traveling public. There the immediate area. The existing residential uses and procedure commercial land use district. This project will not conflict with the provisions of an acconservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or standard in the area of the project site.	of the remote populercial land use district Route 66. This proper restaurant to a ray JD) of Rural Living. 4. The purpose of the uses intermixed with the are no hazard over posed rural commendation.	ation and the ct within an ar opect intends the control of the con	traveling purea of Rural I or bring the community. The community of the community of the community of the community of the component of the co	blic. The Living land community hange the use district o meet the the site or the Rural Community
X.	MINERAL RESOURCES — Would the project:				
a)	Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?				\boxtimes
b)	Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?				\boxtimes

10

Potentially Significant Impact

Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorp. Less than Significant Impact

No Impact

SUBSTANTIATION (check ___ if project is located within the Mineral Resource Zone Overlay):

- a) The project will not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state. There are no identified important mineral resources on the project site and the site is not within a Mineral Resource Zone Overlay.
- b) The project will not result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan, because there are no identified locally important mineral resources on the project site.

XI. NOISE — Would the project result in:

a)	Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other				
	agencies?			\boxtimes	
b)	Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?			\boxtimes	
c)	A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			\boxtimes	
d)	A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			\boxtimes	
e)	For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				\boxtimes
f)	For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				\boxtimes
SU	IBSTANTIATION (check if the project is located in the Noise Haza	ard Overlay District	or is s	subject to sev	vere noise

levels according to the General Plan Noise Element __):

- a) The project will not expose persons to or generate noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies. The project has been conditioned to comply with the noise standards of the County Development Code and no noise exceeding these standards is anticipated to be generated by the proposed uses.
- b) The project will not create exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels. The project will comply with the vibration standards of the County Development Code and no vibration exceeding these standards is anticipated to be generated by the proposed uses.
- c) The project will not generate a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project. The project has been conditioned to comply with the noise standards of the County Development Code and generation of noise by the project that exceeds these standards is not anticipated.
- d) During renovation of the project, noise generated may increase the existing ambient noise levels periodically. Once completed, the project will not generate a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project. Adherence with the noise standards of the County Development Code is a condition of approval.

HIM	MELRICK GPA & CUP (JOB #12324CF1)	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorp.	Less than Significant Impact	No Impac
e) f)	The project is not located near a public/public use airport. The project is not within the vicinity of a private airstrip.				
XII.	POPULATION AND HOUSING — Would the project:				
a)	Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?			\boxtimes	
b)	Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				\boxtimes
c)	Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				\boxtimes
SU	BSTANTIATION:				
b)	full time employees. The types of jobs generated by the project needs of the existing residents in the area. The proposed use will not displace substantial numbers of expelacement housing, because no housing units are proposed to family residence and the triplex that currently exist on the site will the proposed use will not displace substantial numbers of people elsewhere, because the project will not displace any existing hou family residence and the triplex that currently exist on the site will be public services—	disting housing be demolished remain. e necessitating using or existing	units, necessitating das a result of this the construction of	g the construproposal. The	iction of e single- housing
a)	Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
	Fire protection?				\boxtimes
	Police protection?				\boxtimes
	Schools?				\boxtimes
	Parks?				
	Other public facilities?				\boxtimes
SU	BSTANTIATION:				

<u>Fire Protection</u>: The San Bernardino County Fire Department provides fire protection. The project must provide adequate fire flow as required by the Fire Department.

<u>Police Protection</u>: The San Bernardino County Sheriff provides police protection.

Potentially Significant Impact Less than
Significant with
Mitigation Incorp.

Less than Significant Impact

No Impact

Schools: The Helendale Elementary School and the Riverview Middle School are in Helendale. The proposed project will not impact these schools because the restaurant anticipates having only 2 employees. This small number of new jobs will not generate a substantial increase in either the general population or school students.

<u>Parks and other public facilities</u>: The site is located in proximity of the Silver Lake Country Club & Golf Course. Most roads in the vicinity are County-maintained.

ΧIV	REC	REAT	ION	ı
AIV.	REG	REAL	IUIV	_

a)	Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?				\boxtimes	
b)	Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?				\boxtimes	
SU	IBSTANTIATION:					
a) b)	that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated. The project will not generate any new residential units and the impacts generated by the employees of this project will be minimal.					
ΧV	. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC — Would the project:					
a)	Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?			\boxtimes		
b)	Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?			\boxtimes		
c)	Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?				\boxtimes	
d)	Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				\boxtimes	
e)	Result in inadequate emergency access?				\boxtimes	
f)	Result in inadequate parking capacity?				\boxtimes	
g)	Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	П		П	\bowtie	

Potentially Significant Impact Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorp. Less than Significant Impact

No Impact

SUBSTANTIATION:

- a) The County Traffic Division visited the proposed project site and determined that there will be no traffic impacts as a result of the project. The proposed project intends to serve the residents of the area and the traveling public along Historic Route 66.
- b) As stated above, the County Traffic Division determined that the proposed project will not cause the level of service to fall below the established standard of LOS C.
- c) The site is not located near a public airport or a private airstrip. Therefore, no potential for significant impact exists.
- d) The proposed project will not result in roadway hazards. The entrance to the proposed project is at a point on National Trails Highway where there is a good line of sight distance.
- e) The proposed project will not result in inadequate emergency access, because there are a minimum of two access points.
- f) The proposed project has adequate parking capacity delineated for the uses proposed. The project meets the parking standards established by the County Development Code.
- g) The proposed project does not conflict with plans promoting alternative transportation. The Victor Valley Transit Authority has a bus route that includes Helendale. There is a bus stop across National Trails Highway from the proposed project site.

XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS — Would the project:

a)	Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?			\boxtimes
b)	Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?			\boxtimes
c)	Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?			\boxtimes
d)	Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?		\boxtimes	
e)	Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?			\boxtimes
f)	Be served by a landfill(s) with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?		\boxtimes	
g)	Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?			\boxtimes

SUBSTANTIATION:

a) The proposed project will not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board, Lahontan Region, as determined by County Public Health – Environmental Health Services.

Potentially Significant Impact Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorp. Less than Significant Impact

No Impact

- b) Two existing on-site water wells and an on-site septic system will serve the proposed project. These must meet the requirements and standards of the County Environmental Health Services Division and the Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board.
- c) The proposed project will not require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities that cause significant environmental effects. County Public Works has determined that there is sufficient capacity in the existing storm water system to absorb any additional stormwater drainage caused by the project.
- d) As stated above, the Division of Environmental Health Services will verify the quality and quantity of the well water serving the proposed project. According to preliminary DEHS review, sufficient water supplies are available for the proposed project.
- e) As stated above, the Division of Environmental Health Services will verify that the existing on-site septic system is adequate to serve the proposed project. Additional improvements, if necessary, are included as conditions of approval for the proposed project.
- f) The solid waste generated by the project would be removed from the site and taken to the Regional Landfill located in Victorville at least twice per week. This landfill has sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs.
- g) The proposed project is required to comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE—

a)	of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?		\boxtimes	
b)	Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?		\boxtimes	
c)	Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?		\boxtimes	

SUBSTANTIATION:

- a) Although the site is located in an area that is designated as potential habitat for the Desert Tortoise and the Mojave Ground Squirrel, the site does not contain suitable vegetation to support either species. The project site is currently developed with the structures proposed for restaurant use, in addition to the single- and multi-family residential structures on site. The property immediately adjacent to the site is already developed with a preschool and daycare center. The proposed project is not located within an area that would affect sensitive species, wetlands or riparian habitat. The 2.55 acre project site is not located in an area with documented or known historical or archaeological resources. Although the site is within an area known to contain paleontological resources, the site has been developed for decades. Since additional ground disturbance is not proposed as part of this project, there will be no adverse impacts.
- b) The proposed project would not produce effects that could be considered cumulatively considerable. The proposed project would create a Rural Commercial land use district and establish a small 'Mom & Pop' restaurant that is consistent with the purpose and locational criteria of the Rural Commercial district. The 2.55-acre site is immediately adjacent to Historic Route 66 and an already developed parcel. Off-site roadways are paved; on-site roadways are not paved. An

Potentially Significant Impact Less than
Significant with
Mitigation Incorp.

Less than Significant Impact

No Impact

asphalt-concrete driveway approach from National Trails Highway is a condition of approval. The existing parking lot is concrete. All dirt drives will require dustproofing as a condition of approval.

c) As discussed in this Initial Study, the proposed project is not anticipated to result in environmental effects that would cause any adverse effects on human beings.

August 2004

REFERENCES (List author or agency, date, title)

Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zone Act Map Series (PRC 27500)

California Department of Water Resources, Bulletin #118 (Critical Regional Aquifers), 1975.

County Museum Archaeological Information Center

County of San Bernardino, Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan, March 1995

County of San Bernardino Development Code, revised 2004

County of San Bernardino General Plan, adopted 1989, revised 2003

County of San Bernardino Land Use District/Hazard Overlay Maps EH22 & EHFH

County of San Bernardino Identified Hazardous Materials Waste Sites List, April 1998

County Road Planning and Design Standards

Environmental Impact Report, San Bernardino County General Plan, 1989

Federal Emergency Management Agency Flood Insurance Rate Map and Flood Boundary Map

Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District, <u>Mojave Desert Planning Area – Federal Particulate Matter (PM10)</u> <u>Attainment Plan</u>, July 1995

Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District, Rules 202, 219, and 403

South Coast Air Quality Management District, CEQA Air Quality Handbook, November 1993